

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-7 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-7 are rejected

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Ziegler et al.  
(US 6,778,867 B1).

Claims 3-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ziegler et al.  
(US 6,778,867 B1).

The Applicants traverse the rejections and request reconsideration

***General Remarks***

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the telephonic interview on December 23, 2008. Further to the discussions with the Examiner, the Applicants respectfully amend claims 1, 2 and 3 to further define the term “teaching pendant” as a device that is used to implement a teaching playback method. This amendment is clearly supported by at least paragraph [0002] of the published Application.

***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)***

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Ziegler et al.

By this amendment the Applicants have clearly defined what a “teaching pendant” is. Therefore, the Examiner is requested to withdraw his incorrect position that the Applicants define a pendant in the Specification as an enabling switch and a circuit adapted to interlock with the enabling switch to generate a driving signal for a servo power supply of the robot.

Further, the Applicants reiterate that the pendant “includes” an enabling switch and a circuit adapted to interlock. However, a pendant is neither synonymous nor equivalent to an

enabling switch and a circuit adapted to interlock. The Specification, as a whole, would convey to a skilled artisan that a teaching pendant of claim 1 is used for teaching a robot using the teaching playback method.

The Applicants reiterate that any microprocessor cannot be considered to be a teaching pendant that implements the teaching playback method. There is no indication, or even a remote suggestions, in Zeigler that any of the controllers are used to teach the robot using the teaching playback method.

To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the reference must teach every element and limitation of the Applicant's claims either explicitly or inherently. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are proper only when the claimed subject matter is identically disclosed or described in the prior art. See MPEP § 2131. In fact, the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the claim. Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

The Examiner has not established anticipation of claims 1 and 2 by Zeigler at least because of the above-noted differences between the teachings of Zeigler and the present invention.

Further, the Applicants respectfully submit that Ziegler CUSP No. 6,778,867) relates to an apparatus for monitoring operation of a manipulator. For example, an area of operation of the manipulator is doubly monitored. If the manipulator strays from the area, the manipulator is stopped by outputting an anomalous output.

On the contrary, the present invention relates to a controlling apparatus of a robot (manipulator). Normally, a pendant having a single enabling switch is provided. However, the present invention (as recited in claims 2 and 3) is provided with another enabling switch. Then, the two enabling

switches transmit signal by signal wires instead of a communication means such as CAN described in Ziegler.

Further, in Ziegler, operation (area or speed) is monitored for the security of an operator.

On the contrary, in the present invention, the operator 1 (teacher) is monitored by the operator 2 (supervisor). If the operator 1 meets danger, the operation of the robot is stopped by turning off the enabling switch held by the operator 2. Namely, if any one of the enabling switches of the operators 1 and 2 is turned off, an actuating power supply of the robot is cut off and is stopped. Then, the enabling switches of both operators 1 and 2 are turned on, the actuating power supply of the robot is turned on, and teaching by the operator 1 can be continued.

Thus, Ziegler discloses neither that the operator 2 holds an enabling switch as well as a pendant having an enabling switch held by the operator 1 in order to monitor the security of the operator 1 by monitor of the operator 2.

***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)***

Claims 3-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ziegler et al..

Claim 3 includes limitations analogous to the ones described above in relation to claims 1 and 2. Therefore, it is patentable at least for analogous reasons.

Claims 4 -7 are dependant on claim 3, and therefore, are unobvious over Ziegler at least for the reasons discussed above.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Chidambaram.S.Iyer/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550

**65565**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 2, 2009

---

Chid S. Iyer  
Registration No. 43,355